THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY Washington, D. C.

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
OCTOBER 13, 1978, IN THE FACULTY
CONFERENCE ROOM, SIXTH FLOOR,
LISNER HALL

1

2

3

The meeting was called to order by President Elliott at 2:15 p.m.

Present: President Elliott, Provost Bright, Parliamentarian Smalls, Amling, Baker, Birnbaum, Chandler, Chitwood, Claeyssens, Cohn, Hill, Jones, Kurtz, Loeser, Park, Pierpont, Reesing, Schiff, Wallace, and Wood

Absent: Registrar Gebhardtsbauer, Fox, Ginsburg, Heddesheimer, Kramer, Lessin, Liebowitz, Linton, McDonald, Rashid, Robinson, Sapin, Shotel, Solomon, Steiner, Toridis,

Walker, and Ziolkowski

The minutes of the regular meeting of September 15, 1978, were approved as distributed.

Professor Wood, on behalf of Professor Ziolkowski, moved the nomination of Brad McMahon as a student member for election to the Library committee, and he moved the nominations of Professor Arthur Friedman and Professor Herman H. Hobbs for election to the Physical Facilities Committee. There were no objections and Mr. McMahon, Professor Friedman, and Professor Hobbs were elected unanimously.

Professor Claeyssens asked for suspension of the rules in order to nominate David Chapin, GWUSA student nominee, and Margaret E. Vann for election to the Public Ceremonies Committee. No objections were made and Mr. Chapin and Ms. Vann were elected unanimously.

Professor Schiff asked for suspension of the rules in order to nominate Jonathan Katz, GWUSA student nominee, for election to the Educational Policy Committee. No objections were made and Mr. Katz was elected unanimously.

President Elliott stated that he wished to add an item to the agenda, which he was advised was permissible under the rules, by recognizing Professor Wood for the purpose of introducing a resolution. Professor Wood

then read the following resolution:

A RESOLUTION CONCERNING DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS TAKEN AGAINST TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS

WHEREAS, the intent of tenure is to safeguard academic freedom; and

WHEREAS, penalties other than dismissal can inhibit academic freedom or lead to a resignation; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the Faculty Code be amended as follows:

- (1) Any serious disciplinary action taken against a tenured faculty member shall be preceded by a warning stating the complaint and by a grievance procedure instituted by the complainant in accord with Faculty Code, Section E. "Procedures for Implementation of Article X of the Faculty Code."
- (2) Serious disciplinary actions shall include but not be limited to adverse action with respect to salary or teaching assignments, actions which substantially adversely discriminate against one faculty member in comparison to other faculty members.
- (3) The foregoing provisions should not be interpreted to prevent reasonable discrimination on the basis of the quality of service rendered by faculty members.
- (4) The Faculty Senate, its Executive Committee or its Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, as well as the affected faculty member, can initiate grievance procedures if any of those parties believes the foregoing provisions have not been observed.

Professor Wood moved adoption of the resolution and Professor Kurtz seconded the motion. Professor Jones asked Professor Wood if his intent was to have the Senate approve this resolution and if the Senate members had a text of the resolution. Professor Wood explained that his objective in introducing Committee for referral to the appropriate Senate Committee, and that no unanimously approved referral of the resolution to the Executive Committee for subsequent referral to the appropriate Senate Committee.

Under Brief Statements, Professor Park said that he wished to report on the action taken by the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee on the projected guidelines for 1981-82 as to tenure-track allocations in the University (letter dated October 13, 1978, to President Elliott from Professor

4

Park, Chairman, Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, attached). Professor Park then reported as follows:

As you know, the University is carrying a top-heavy burden of tenured positions, so the concern in creating a tenure-track quota system was to cut back on the number of tenure -track slots on some realistic basis related to enrollments and tied to faculty retirements. words, we project out several years what faculty will be retiring from tenure -track positions and then try to fashion a fair allocation among the schools and colleges so that over a long term of years the University can correct some of this imbalance on the tenure that it carries. Some schools, for example, the School of Government and Business Administration, are under-tenured in terms of accrediting requirements; other schools, like the Law School, carry almost 100% tenured positions. There is no intent here for cutting back the number of tenure slots very severely -- the expectation is that we will end up somewhere around 60% to 75% in tenure-track positions, but it is an attempt to make a realistic gradual adjustment in the allocation to reflect enrollments and well-being of the various schools.

In 1981-82 there are four positions now held by tenured faculty that will be opening because of retirements—two in Columbian College; one in the School of Education; and one in the School of Law. The recommendation of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee was simply to deduct those from the present allocation of tenured positions. Dropping two from Columbian College would leave Columbian College with 241 tenure—track positions; School of Education with 35; School of Engineering with 51; School of Government and Business Administration with 64; and School of Law with 34. I should mention that no deans or associate deans are included in those figures, so some schools actually carry more tenure slots than these numbers reflect. So, the total number of non-administrative, tenure—track positions for the University would be 425.

Now, the expectation is that these totals would be reviewed and revised every year by the Committee, so, if by some chance a school changes its direction in enrollment and some special need appears, it will be possible in the next year, or even in the interim, for the Committee to review it and act again. It is quite a flexible process and an annual review does give us, by planning out four years, a chance to make realistic adjustments. While the Committee's expectation is that the Administration would enjoy some freedom to make minor adjustments as are necessary on a current basis, the Committee would like to ask the Administration to consult with it on even minor changes to the guidelines before implementation, in the spirit of consulting with the faculty on planning tenure—track allocations.

Another point the Committee considered was the decision by the Board of Trustees to extend employment to faculty to age 70. Now, if everyone stayed to age 70, it means that the retirement slots would be pushed out 5 years. On the basis of experience of schools that have for some years used an age 70 compulsory retirement age, we don't expect people to stay to age 70--usually people retire between age 66 and 68, and usually closer to age 66. So, for your information, we wanted to call to your attention that in future years, as we try to adjust the quotas, we are going to have to consider the impact of faculty members exercising their option to stay beyond age 65, because the present quota mechanics are based on the old 65 compulsory retirement age, and we have simply deducted from the schools where they fell the 1981-82 tenure-track retirements.

Professor Schiff said that he thought Professor Park's report was an important matter and he was sorry that it was not listed as an agenda item. He asked if there was any clarification on the stand of the AAUP as to what happens to non-tenure track individuals at the end of seven years, and whether or not the University has any choice but to terminate them. Professor Park responded that the Committee had not considered the AAUP limit generally and that he could not answer Professor Schiff's question in an informed way. Provost Bright said he thought that continuing a faculty member in a non-tenure track position beyond the 7 years' limit would undoubtedly violate AAUP requirements, but he thought the University ought to go against them. He added that many schools have been blacklisted by the AAUP, but this doesn't appear to have affected them. Further discussion followed by Professors Park, Schiff, and Hill. Professor Park said he would inquire into the question raised by Professor Schiff and would report back to the Senate as an announced item.

Professor Jones said that he had been requested to take this opportunity to commend the athletic programs for men and women at GW, and to urge the faculty, staff and students to support the 16 varsity teams which now represent the University. He said it was especially gratifying to the Committee to note the progress in varsity sports for women whose activities do not simply replicate the "grunt and groan" routines of the other sex, but appropriately evoke skills and talents in sports of their own choosing. Therefore, Professor Jones said, the Athletics Committee commends the philosophy and program emerging under the direction of Lyn H. George, Director of Women's Athletics, and notes the continuing excellent leadership of Robert K. Faris, Director of Men's Athletics, and the Smith Center staff for providing not only varsity sports, but activities for the entire community.

On behalf of the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies, Professor Cohn, Chairman, submitted for the record a report he received from Mr. William D. Johnson comparing faculty salary and compensation averages for 1976-77 and 1977-78 (report dated June 2, 1978, attached). Professor Cohn said the report shows that full professors have moved up to a rating of 1 on the AAUP scale, association professors are very close to a rating of 1, and assistant professors still lag behind at a level of 3. He noted that compensation for women on the average was still slightly behind that of men, but that in the School of Education women in all ranks were paid slightly more than men with full professors receiving an average of \$14.00 more a year than men. In Columbian College and the School of Government and Business Administration,

Professor Cohn noted that at the rank of assistant professor, women were paid more than men. He said that the only comparison data he had at the present time was a copy of an article which appeared in The Washington Post showing the current level of GW salaries by rank and comparison with other local universities for 1977-78 (article attached).

Professor Hill reported that the Executive Committee had referred his proposal for the establishment of a no-frills, no-dues, informal faculty coffee house back to him with a request to look into the question of space availability since it was the Executive Committee's opinion that a poll of the faculty on this proposal would be largely meaningless. Professor Hill said that he would continue to negotiate for a suitable place and he hoped that the idea would not get dropped because he had received letters of support for this idea and he hoped to be able to report some progress in the near future.

Professor Wood announced that James P. Chandler, Professor of Law, had been elected to the Faculty Senate to finish the term of Professor Teresa M. Schwartz, who is on leave. Professor Wood welcomed Professor Chandler. He then advised the Senate that he had received a memorandum from Professor Fox relating to Professor Hill's proposal for a faculty coffee house in which Professor Fox recommends that if the Executive Committee undertakes or assigns the task of obtaining faculty opinion on this proposal he would encourage opinion to be sought on how the existing University Club can better serve the University community.

Professor Amling, Chairman, University Development and Resources Committee, said that his Committee thought it appropriate to include in the minutes the following list of costs involved for the various named endowments at the University:

> Designated Gifts and Memorials Minimums for Named Endowments (as of October, 1978)

Chair

University Professor	\$1,000,000
Distinguished Profess	or 750,000
Professorship	500,000
Assistant Professorship	250,000
Lectureship - visiting	200,000
Fellowship	100,000
Scholarship or Loan Fund	25,000
Annual Lecture or Special	Fund 10,000
Prize Fund	2,000

Buildings key gift

Components of Buildings cost

Professor Amling said that many members of the Committee themselves were not aware of this list and the relative value attached to each endowment and, therefore, thought this would be useful information for the faculty to have with regard to the development needs of the schools and the University. In light of the growing amount of deferred giving on the part of faculty to the University, Professor Amling said that substantial sums of money could very well fall into this classification.

Upon motion made and seconded, the President adjourned the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

Robert Gebhardtsbauer, Secretary



October 13, 1978

President Lloyd H. Elliott Rice Hall Campus

Dear President Elliott:

The Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee has now acted to recommend "tenure track" position guidelines for 1981-82, and has reported these recommendations to the Faculty Senate. Having no instructions from the Senate to modify these guidelines, I report them as adopted by the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee.

1981-82 Planning Guidelines for Tenure Track	Positions	
Columbian College, G.S.A.S. and S.P.T.A.	241	
School of Education and Human Development	35	
School of Engineering and Allied Sciences	51	
School of Government and Business Adminis.	64	
National Law Center	34	
Total	425	

This represents a net change of minus four positions in accord with the number of faculty reaching age 65 in 1981-82.

The Committee recognizes that increases in the allocation of "tenure track" positions may become necessary to meet accreditation requirements of the School of Government and Business Administration. It recognizes, further, that significant changes in enrollment, upward or downward, will justify reallocations and/or changes in the total of such positions. It asks, however, that even in the case of "minor adjustments" to these totals that the Committee be consulted prior to such changes so that the principle of faculty participation in these important planning decisions may be fully realized.

The Committee notes, too, that the decision by the Board of Trustees to extend employment to faculty to age 70 will have a substantial impact upon faculty retirements. At most, the extension of employment to age 70 might push the guidelines out five years as to reductions. More realistically, the

Committee anticipates that the faculty will retire at an average age between 66 and 68, since that is the experience of many universities that have not been requiring retirement prior to age 70. In any case, the Committee notes for the record that the annual review process may soon involve the additional problem of faculty electing to remain beyond age 65 and that this may postpone the realization of the reduction in the total number of "tenure track" positions.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert E. Park

Professor of Law and Chairman, Faculty Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting

Copies to: Members, Faculty Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

June 2, 1978

Memorandum to Deans Linton, Tillman, Liebowitz, Vaill, Solomon, Kramer and Sapin

The attached report comparing faculty salary and compensation averages for 1976-77 and 1977-78 is forwarded for your information. Items I through V are as reported to us by the AAUP. Item VI reports average salaries by school, rank and sex for 1977-78. The appropriate aggregation of this data produces the summary data used by the AAUP.

Item I reflects the national average compensation distributed through five percentile groupings for Category I institutions. The balance of the data reported are either average compensation or average salary, as indicated, at the George Washington University.

It is worth noting that full professors have moved up to a rating of 1, and that associate professors are very close to a rating 1. It is possible, if not probable, that the associate rank will move into the first rating in 1978-79. Assistant professors are still lagging well behind, and I think we will want to take this into consideration when salary policies for 1979-80 are developed.

William D. Johnson Director of Planning and Budgeting

cc: Budget Committee

Miss Phelps, Assistant Provost

Professor Cohn, Chairman of Senate Committee on Appointment

Salary and Promotion Policies

(w/copy of AAUP Report)

Professor Park, Chairman of Senate Committee on Planning

and Budgeting

Professor Wood, Chairman of Senate Executive Committee

THE GLOKOL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY Faculty Salary and Compensation Averages (Excluding the Medical Center) Comparative Summary 1977-78 4 1976-77

1.	1977-78 Actual	Distribution of	Average Compensations
		I Institutions,	

Totals Included - 1976-77 (Excluding Instructors)

1.	for Category 1 I			ensactons		
	Percentiles	95	80	60	40	20
	Ratings	1*	1	2	3.	4
	Professor	37,230	32,710	30,430	28,270	26,160
	Associate	26,440	24,430	23,260	22,000	20,950
	Assistant	20,870	19,530	18,810	17,950	17,310
	Instructor	18,090	16,210	15,190	14,430	13,410
				• 1		
				1	AAUP Ra	
11.	Average Compensati	on at G.W.	1977-78	1976-77	1977-78	1976-77
	Professor		33,100	31,200	1	2
	Associate		24,200	22,800	2	2
	Assistant		18,200	17,500	3	3
	Instructor		N.R.	14,900	N.R.	4.
						No. 2 is
111.	Average Salary at	G.W.				% increa
****	Average outdry at				% increase	Continuing
			20 700	27 700	5.1	6.7
	Professor		28,700	27,300	5.1	7.2
	Associate		20,600	19,600	2.7	7.5
	Assistant		15,300	14,900	2.7	
	Instructor		N.R.	12,600	-	•
IV.	Average Compensati	on by	1			
	Rank & Sex - 197	7-78				
			Women	Men		
	Professor		29,500	33,400		1
	Associate		23,200	24,400		
	Assistant		17,400	18,500		
	ASSIStant		27,100			
٧.	Number Included in					
	Each Rank - 1977	7-78	Total	Women	Men	
				10	189	
	Professor		208	19	110	
	Associate		132	22	72	
	Assistant	4.	97	25	$\frac{72}{371}$	
	T	otals	437	66	3/1	
					760	

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON D.C. 20036
TELEPHONE 202 466 8050

IMPORTANT NOTE:

This year the data published by institution will appear in the same manner. However, it is very important that the explanations given in the enclosed covering letter be read by each respondent. Corrections or inquiries should be directed to MARYSE EYMONERIE at above address before MAY 31

1977-1978 ACTUAL DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE COMPENSATIONS

INSTITUTIONS

PROFESSOR 37,230 32,710 30,430 28,270 26,160 ASSOCIATE 26,440 24,430 23,250 22,000 20,950 ASSISTANT 20,870 19,530 18,810 17,950 17,310 INSTRUCTOR 18,090 16,210 15,190 14,430 13,410

FOR CATEGORY I

PRESIDENT GEORGE WASH UNIVERSITY WASHINGTON DC 20052 01444

INTERPRETATION OF THE RATINGS: 1° = 95th PERCENTILE. 1 = 80th PERCENTILE. 2 = 60th PERCENTILE ETC. AVERAGE COMPENSATION, LOWER THAN 20th PERCENTILE ARE RATED 5.

(1)	(3)		14	1)								(10)								
N O	INSTI- TUTION CATEGORY	RATING OF AVG COMPENSATION BY RANK							BY F	NUMBER OF FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS BY RANK, TENURE STATUS AND BY SEX (% TENURED ROUNDED NEAREST UNIT)						AVG. COMPENSATION (IN THOUSANDS) BY RANK				
E S		PROF	SSO	S	N S T												РЯОБ	ASSO	ASST	INST
02	FI	1	2	3	•	PROF	200	3	ASSO	132	ž	ASST	97	INST	*4		33.1.	24.2	18.2	
	MAJ BEN						10 FAC	% TEN		NO FAC	TEN		NO %	•	NO %					
	VHF				٧	MEN	199	92. ALL	MEN	110	78. 86.	MEN	72 21. 25 28.	MEN	4	MEN WOMEN	33.4 29.5	24.4	18.5	
					((9)	1"						(6)		(8		50	(7) LARY		
												FRIN	IGE BENE	FITS	PERCENTAG	E				

AVERAGE SALARY IIN THOUSANDS)
BY HANK, SEX, AND FOR ALL HANKS
PROFESSOR ASSOCIATE ASSISTANT

INSTRUCTOR

AS PERCENT OF AVERAGE SALARY (NEAREST UNIT) PERCENTAGE
SALARY INCREASE
FOR
CONTINUING FACULTY

SALARY
DISTRIBUTION
ALL MANKS COMBINED
(IN THOUSANDS)

MEN WOM ALL MEN WOM ALL MEN WOM ALL MEN WOM ALL

PROF ASSO ASST INST

PROF ASSO ASST INST

HQ MON LQ

(5)

29.0 25.6 28.7 20.8 19.3 20.6 15.5 14.6 15.3 ---- 15. 17. 19. --- 6.7 7.2 7.5 10.2 27.9 22.5 18.2

* I wouse horst all port is the right

(OVER)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY FACULTY SALARY AVERAGES BY SCHOOL

1978 - 1979

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Columbian College	00	7.3	59
Number	98		\$ 15,403
Average Salary	\$ 28,136	\$ 20,000	7 13,403
Education & Human Dev.	*		
Number	21	13	7
Average Salary	\$ 27,247	\$ 20,753	
,			
		7. k 1. 12	10 10 h
Engineering & Appl. Sci.			
Number	31	14	3
Average Salary	\$ 30,683	\$ 22,709	\$ 18,350
		The state of the s	Steel of the
Govt. & Business Admin.	0.0	24	11
Number	26		\$ 21,256
Average Salary	\$ 30,824	\$ 24,303	7 21,250
National Law Center			
Number	32	0	0
Average Salary	\$ 38,080		-
nverage sensity			
Public & Int. Affairs			
Number	6	6	2
Average Salary	\$ 32,892	\$ 23,916	**

NOTES: 1. Number in GSAS too few to report separately.

2. Number of Assistant Professors in Public & Int. Affairs too few to report separately.

3. Figures do not include deans, associate deans, and individuals in adjunct, research or visiting ranks.

THE WASHINGTON POST

Average Faculty Compensation at Washington Area Universities(1977-78) Associate + Associate Professor Professor \$29,800 American University \$22,600 \$18,500 : 44 6 A 16,800 Catholic University 26,200 20,100 University of D.C. 35,700 22,400 27,200 24,600 George Mason U. 20,000 16,700 George Washington U. 33,100 24,200 18,200 Georgetown University 34,300 25,300 19,800 **Howard University** 32,700 24,500 20,200 University of Maryland 30,700 22,900 18,900 Source: American Association of University Professors, Annual Survey of Faculty Compensation

Miles.

ate degrees. It is highest for instructors at two-year community colleges.

University of the District of Columbia pay is relatively high in all categories. Compared to Yale, for example, UDC pay is \$1,400 less than the average for full professors, but \$3,900 above Yale for associate professors, \$5,200 more for assistant professors and \$4,900 more for instructors.

At a hearing yesterday Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.), chairman of the Senate By Milton Clipper-The Washington

District Appropriations subcommittee, said Congress, wants to support the academic program at the city university, but he again expressed doubt about the need for a new \$56 million downtown campus Just north of Mount Vernon Square.

University president Liste C. Carrer Jr. noted that plans for the new campus have already been approved by the D.C. government and House District Appropriations subcommittee.

Faculty Senate Meeting - October 13, 1978 Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate

October 4, 1978

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, October 13, 1978, at 2:10 p.m., in the Faculty Conference Room on the Sixth Floor of Lisner Hall.

AGENDA

- 1. Call to order
- 2. Minutes of the regular meeting of September 15, 1978
- 3. General Business:

Nomination for election of Brad McMahon, student, to the Library Committee; Professor Ziolkowski, Chairman

- 4. Brief Statements
- 5. Adjournment

Robert Gebhardtsbauer Secretary

Aut Sevherater auce

PTIA TUNNEL POPURERAJAS JORGANIJES

Marine server in Mil

The Albert Mys Especie will repair on Articles of the experiment of the cold, and this require the tra-Fermity Cinimeraty Simple Franciscope (the Signa of Communication and Company and Asymptotics)

esales es est distili

esta i ja kon ne geografi kon kalagara estigaen jada da da sakidik kal

programme of the state of

Americandon for elemente, of fraid historic activates of the company of the Algunding Company of

Artel Statements

The part of the

passification and following